

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1 and 3-13 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 3 and 6 are currently amended. Claims 14-17 are new. The now pending claims in the application in accord with 37 CFR 1.121, as revised, are set forth above.

No new matter has been introduced by virtue of the amendments made herein. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request their entry. In view of the amendments made herein and the remarks below, applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection set forth in the November 21, 2005 office action.

### **Objections**

The Examiner objected to the term "arly-alkoxy" on claim 1. In response, applicants have amended claim 1 to recite "aryl-alkoxy."

The Examiner objected to the claims 6 and 7 because they depend on cancelled claim 2. In response, applicants have amended claims 6 and 7 to depend on claim 3.

### **Rejection under 35 USC § 112, first paragraph**

The Examiner rejected claims 3, 5, and 8-9 under 35 USC § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly being not enabled. Specifically, the Examiner states that the claim encompass various catalysts, however, the use of a mixture of palladium II acetate, tricyclohexylphosphine and base is the only exemplified catalyst in the specification. The Examiner uses the reasoning of Ex Parte Sizto, 9 USPQ 2d 2081 (Bd.Pat.App. & Int.1988) as a basis of the rejection.

Applicants note that Ex Parte Sizto involved the use of enzyme catalysts which may share the same name and general purpose (i.e. to catalyze); however, enzyme catalysts and the metal catalysts referred to in the subject application are very different in nature.

Without prejudice and solely in the interests of facilitating prosecution, applicants have amended claim 3 to recite "metal catalyst."

Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that claims 3, 5, and 8-9 are allowable under 35 USC § 112, first paragraph and request withdrawal of the rejection.

### **Rejection under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph**

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-5, and 8-13 under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being vague because of the recitation of the phrase "hetero-alkyl" in claims 1 and 3.

Without prejudice and solely in the interests of facilitating prosecution, applicants have amended claims 1 and 3 to delete the phrase "hetero-alkyl."


Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that claims 1 and 3 are allowable under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph and request withdrawal of the rejection.

In view of the remarks above and the amendments submitted herein, applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are fully allowable, and solicit the issuance of a notice to such effect. If a telephone interview is deemed to be helpful to expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned attorney at the telephone number provided.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 and 1.17 or to credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 16-1445.

Date: 12/15/05

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Jason G. Tebbutt  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Reg. No. 55,671

David Joran  
Attorney for Appellant(s)  
Reg. No. 37,858

Pfizer Inc  
Patent Department  
150 East 42nd Street – 5<sup>th</sup> Floor  
New York, NY 10017-5755  
(212) 733-4827